<u>REMARKS</u>

Introduction and status of claims

• Claims 1-60 are pending in this application.

• Various claims have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard

as their invention; these changes have been made for the purposes of clarification only, and

no change in scope of the claims is either intended or believed to be effected by the changes.

• Claims 1, 14, 23, and 44 are in independent form.

The claim objections

Claims 1, 8, 14, 23, 28, 35, 38, 44, 49, and 58 were objected to for the reasons set out at

paragraph 1 of the Office Action. These claims have been corrected accordingly and,

therefore, withdrawal of their objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-13, 18-22, 25-34, 38-43, and 51-60 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c)

for being in improper multiply dependent form (see paragraph 2 of the Office Action). These

claims have been amended to remove this issue. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is

respectfully requested.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 57 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for undue breadth (see

paragraph 4 of the Office Action). Claim 57 has been amended to recite an apparatus for

encoding digital video data, comprising a *unit* adapted for performing the steps of the method.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-56 and 58-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, for the reasons provided at paragraph 6 of the Office Action.

First, the Examiner states that claim 58 is directed to software and fails to positively recite non-transitory media for storing software/program. Claim 58 has been amended to recite a non-transitory computer-readable medium storing a program containing instructions which, when executed by at least one processor, causes the processor to perform the steps of the method.

Second, the Examiner states that method claims 1-56 and 60 do not fall within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Independent claims 1, 14, 23, and 44 have been amended to recite that the claimed method(s) are implemented on a computer having a processor and a memory coupled to the processor, at least some of the steps of the method(s) being performed by the processor.

Third, the Examiner stated regarding claim 59 that "coded sequence" might be referred to as signal/data which is not one of the four statutory categories as set forth in Section 101. Claim 59 has been amended herein to recite a transmitter, comprising a processor operable to generate a coded sequence by performing the compression method.

For at least the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection under Section 101 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request

favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Raymond A. DiPerna/
Raymond A. DiPerna
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 44063
Tel. No. (212) 708-1950